arXiv:1402.4385v1 [physics.soc-ph] 18 Feb 2014

The map equation and the resolution limit in community detection

Tatsuro Kawamoto[1] and Martin Rosvall[2]

[1] *Department of Physics, The University of Tokyo, Komaba, Meguro, Tokyo 153-8505, Japan*
[2] *Integrated Science Lab, Department of Physics, Umeå University, SE-901 87 Umeå, Sweden*

(Dated: February 19, 2014)

The resolution limit is known to prevent some community detection algorithms from accurately identifying the modular structure of a network. In fact, any global objective function for measuring the quality of a two-level assignment of nodes into modules must have some sort of resolution limit and aggregate small modules in sufficiently large networks. However, it is yet unknown how the resolution limit affects the so-called map equation, which is known to be an efficient objective function for community detection. We derive an analytical estimate and conclude that the resolution limit of the map equation is orders of magnitudes smaller than it is for modularity in practice. The resolution limit is less restrictive for the map equation than for modularity, because it is set by the total number of links between modules instead of the total number of links in the entire network. Furthermore, we argue that the effect of the resolution limit often results from shoehorning multilevel modular structures into two-level descriptions. As we show, the hierarchical map equation is effectively resolution limit-free.

The ability to detect the community structure of networks plays an important role in the analysis of complex systems. Therefore, researchers have developed a suite of community detection algorithms based on different principles or heuristics [1–7]. Many methods require the number of modules as input, but some global objective functions, such as *modularity* [1] and the *map equation* [3], intrinsically identify the number of modules. While the widely used method of modularity has been studied extensively [4, 8–11], less is known about the inner workings of the map equation [12, 13], despite its strong performance when companioned with its search algorithm Infomap [14, 15]. Interestingly, the resolution limit [16], which causes small modules to aggregate in larger modules in modularity maximization and can lead to poor performance, seems to have an unnoticeable effect on the map equation [17]. Since any global objective function for two-level community detection must have a resolution limit, it is important to understand how the map equation succeeds at suppressing the effect of the resolution limit. In this Letter, we analytically derive the resolution limit of the map equation and show why the map equation can resolve a much wider range of module sizes than modularity can.

The resolution limit is the consequential downside of methods that intrinsically identify the number of modules in a network. We conceptually illustrate this fact with the two-level map equation applied to the global road network. The map equation framework seeks an optimal modular description of a random walker on the network. This maximum compression is achieved by balancing the description length of movements within and between modules. With many small modules, representing city neighborhoods, for example, the within-module description length is short at the cost of a very long between-module description length. Contrarily, with few large modules, representing continents, for example, the between-module description length is short at the cost of a very long within-module description length. Consequently, the optimal two-level description length is achieved by identifying modules of intermediate sizes, such as neighborhoods aggregated into cities. This example makes clear that the resolution limit can arise because a two-level community detection method is applied to a multi-level structure with nested modules. We argue that this case should be considered unproblematic, and show later that the solution is to use a multi-level clustering method [18].

However, it is more problematic when a method aggregates small modules in a plain modular structure. In this case, a mechanistic understanding of how a method performs is critical for its successful application [16, 19–21]. For example, in a network with L links, Fortunato and Barthélemy [16] showed that modularity cannot detect a module of size less than about $\sqrt{L}$ links. This limit is a result of the intrinsic scale of the method [11, 12]. It has been experimentally verified that the map equation has an upper limit of detectability: Infomap splits non-clique structures with large diameters, such as strings and lattices [12], but the resolution limit at which modules cannot be fully resolved by the map equation is still unknown.

To derive the limit and show how it depends on the network structure, we begin by reviewing the machinery of the map equation. For simplicity, we consider flow induced by a random walker on undirected unweighted networks. To detect modules in which a random walker stays for a relatively long time, the map equation measures the minimum modular description length of the random walker's trajectory [3]. The original version of the map equation assigns nodes to single modules only and uses a modular code structure that is constrained to two levels. Specifically, it uses a single index codebook for coding movements entering modules and multiple modu-

lar codebooks for coding movements within and exiting modules, one for each module. The optimal partition is the one that compresses the description the most, and thereby reveals the maximum modular regularities in the network.

In detail, given a two-level partition M that assigns the nodes of a network into m modules, the description length $L(\mathsf{M})$ is the sum of the average description length of all codebooks weighted by their rate of use. That is,

$$L(\mathsf{M}) = q_{\curvearrowright} H(\mathcal{Q}) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_{i\circlearrowright} H(\mathcal{P}_i). \tag{1}$$

The first term is the average description length of the index codebook. Its rate of use $q_{\curvearrowright} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i\curvearrowright}$ is the sum of the entering rates $q_{i\curvearrowright}$ into each module i, and $H(\mathcal{Q}) = -\sum_{i=1}^{m} (q_{i\curvearrowright}/q_{\curvearrowright}) \log(q_{i\curvearrowright}/q_{\curvearrowright})$ is the average description length of the index codebook given by the Shannon entropy of the entering rates into the modules. We use log base 2 throughout this Letter. The second term is the average description length of the module codebooks. The rate of use of module codebook i, $p_{i\circlearrowright} = q_{i\curvearrowright} + \sum_{\alpha\in i} p_\alpha$, is the sum of the exiting rate $q_{i\curvearrowright}$ and the visiting rates p_α of all nodes α in module i, and $H(\mathcal{P}^i) = -(q_{i\curvearrowright}/p_{i\circlearrowright}) \log(q_{i\curvearrowright}/p_{i\circlearrowright}) - \sum_{\alpha\in i} (p_\alpha/p_{i\circlearrowright}) \log(p_\alpha/p_{i\circlearrowright})$ is the average description length of module codebook i. All rates are evaluated at stationarity, such that for undirected networks the rate of entering $q_{i\curvearrowright}$ and exiting $q_{i\curvearrowright}$ a given module i is the same. Using this equality and expanding Eq. (1) gives

$$\begin{aligned} L(\mathsf{M}) = {} & q_{\curvearrowright} \log q_{\curvearrowright} - 2\sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i\curvearrowright} \log q_{i\curvearrowright} \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_{i\circlearrowright} \log p_{i\circlearrowright} - \sum_{\alpha} p_\alpha \log p_\alpha. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Since the sum in the last term runs over all nodes, it does not depend on the choice of partition.

For unweighted networks, the exit probability $q_{i\curvearrowright}$ from module i and the rate of use $p_{i\circlearrowright}$ of module codebook i can be expressed in terms of the number of links as follows:

$$p_\alpha = \frac{k_\alpha}{K}, \tag{3}$$

$$q_{i\curvearrowright} = \sum_{\beta\notin i} \sum_{\alpha\in i} T_{\beta\alpha} p_\alpha = \frac{l_i^{\text{out}}}{K}, \tag{4}$$

$$p_{i\circlearrowright} = q_{i\curvearrowright} + \sum_{\alpha\in i} p_\alpha = 2\frac{l_i + l_i^{\text{out}}}{K}, \tag{5}$$

where k_α is the degree of node α, $T_{\beta\alpha}$ is the transition probability that the random walker moves from node α to node β, l_i^{out} is the number of links which connect the nodes in module i with nodes in other modules, l_i is the number of links within module i, and $K = 2L = \sum_i (2l_i + l_i^{\text{out}})$ is the total degree of the network. Substituting these expressions into Eq. (2) gives

$$\begin{aligned} L(\mathsf{M}) = \frac{1}{K} \Bigg[& 2C \log 2C - 2\sum_{i=1}^{m} l_i^{\text{out}} \log l_i^{\text{out}} + K + 2C \\ & + 2\sum_{i=1}^{m} (l_i + l_i^{\text{out}}) \log(l_i + l_i^{\text{out}}) - \sum_{\alpha} k_\alpha \log k_\alpha \Bigg], \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where k_α is the degree of the node α and C is the *cut size* [6, 7], i.e., $2C = \sum_{i=1}^{m} l_i^{\text{out}}$.

In general, to minimize Eq. (6), we update the partition $\mathsf{M} = \mathsf{A}$ to a nearby partition $\mathsf{M} = \mathsf{B}$ if $\Delta L(\mathsf{M}) = L(\mathsf{B}) - L(\mathsf{A}) < 0$. From Eq. (6), we readily see that there is no resolution limit caused by the total degree K, because it never changes the sign of $\Delta L(\mathsf{M})$. Instead, the resolution limit must depend on the cut size, which controls the only global term. In other words, as long as the update conserves the cut size C, there is no restriction from the global structure under an arbitrary update.

For simplicity, we denote an element in the two sums over modules in Eq. (6) by

$$\mathcal{L}_i = -l_i^{\text{out}} \log l_i^{\text{out}} + (l_i + l_i^{\text{out}}) \log(l_i + l_i^{\text{out}}), \tag{7}$$

and denote the total change over all modules before and after the update by

$$R = \sum_{i'} \mathcal{L}_{i'}(\mathsf{B}) - \sum_{i} \mathcal{L}_i(\mathsf{A}). \tag{8}$$

We now consider a local update where the cut size is decreased by a small δ such that $C \gg \delta > 0$. Then

$$\Delta L(\mathsf{M}) \simeq \frac{2}{K} \left[-\delta \left(2 + \log\left(\mathrm{e}\, C \right) \right) + R \right], \tag{9}$$

where e is the basis of natural logarithm. Therefore, any local update should be accepted if

$$R \lesssim \delta \left(2 + \log\left(\mathrm{e}\, C \right) \right). \tag{10}$$

For updates that increase the cut size, i.e., $\delta < 0$, on the other hand, no local update will be accepted as long as the cut size C is sufficiently large.

To identify the resolution limit, we parallel the analysis of ref. [16] and pinpoint a partition at the point where the map equation can resolve small modules. As shown in Fig. 1, we use a partition A with two modules $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ connected with l_{int} links between them, and l_{13} and l_{23} links, respectively, with the rest of the network $\mathcal{M}_3$. Note that $\mathcal{M}_3$ may consist of many modules, so that Fig. 1 represents a completely general situation. In partition B, the two modules $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ are merged into a single module $\mathcal{M}_{12}$. We then consider an update from partition A to partition B. From Eq. (8) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} R = {} & -l_3^{\text{out}} \log l_3^{\text{out}} + l_2^{\text{out}} \log l_2^{\text{out}} + l_1^{\text{out}} \log l_1^{\text{out}} \\ & + (l_1 + l_1^{\text{out}} + l_2 + l_2^{\text{out}} - l_{\text{int}}) \log(l_1 + l_1^{\text{out}} + l_2 + l_2^{\text{out}} - l_{\text{int}}) \\ & - (l_2 + l_2^{\text{out}}) \log(l_2 + l_2^{\text{out}}) - (l_1 + l_1^{\text{out}}) \log(l_1 + l_1^{\text{out}}), \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$



FIG. 1: A schematic picture for the greedy update of two modules $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$. Note that $\mathcal{M}_3$ may consist of many modules.

where $l_3^{\rm out} = l_{13} + l_{23}$. We now consider the extreme case in which $l_{\rm int} = 1$, i.e., $\delta = 1$, and set the sizes of two modules equal, i.e., $l_1 = l_2 = l_c$, because equal module sizes maximize R. We also set $l_{13} = l_{23} = h$. Then, using the assumption that $l_c + h \gg 1$, we have

$$R \simeq 1 + 2\left[l_c + (1+h)\log(1+h) - h\log h\right] - \log\left[\mathrm{e}(l_c + h)\right]. \quad (12)$$

Assuming that $h = 1$ and using Eq. (10), we obtain the inequality for the resolution limit

$$\frac{4^{l_c}}{l_c + 1} \lesssim C, \quad (13)$$

where we have dropped a small constant factor to highlight the basic scaling. The deviation is less than 10%. Assuming that $h \gg 1$, $(1+h)\log(1+h) - h\log h \simeq \log\left[\mathrm{e}(1+h)\right]$, we instead have

$$\frac{(1+h)^2 4^{l_c}}{2(l_c + h)} \lesssim C. \quad (14)$$

Accordingly, the map equation cannot detect a module with less than l_c links whenever the cut size C satisfies the above conditions. Note that Eqs. (13) and (14) apply only when evaluated close to the global minimum of the map equation. Otherwise, they are only practical restrictions during an optimization process. Furthermore, with $l_1 = l_2 = l$ and $l_{13} = l_{23} = h$ in Fig. 1, the following two examples are worth mentioning: First, if $l_{\rm int} = 0$, $\Delta L(\mathsf{M}) = 4l/K > 0$, and disconnected modules never merge with other modules, as they should not. Second, if $\mathcal{M}_3$ is a single module, $\Delta L(h = 1) > 0$ for $l \geq 2$ and $\partial \Delta L/\partial h > 0$, and $\Delta L(h \to \infty) = 4(l-1)/K$ for any l, such that the map equation can detect modules of arbitrary size with $l \geq 2$.

To illustrate that the resolution limit of the map equation is much smaller in practice and less restrictive than it is for modularity, we consider a simple modular network shown in the inset of Fig. 2. The networks consists of a ring of m modules, each forming a fully connected clique with n nodes. For this network, $C = m$. The plot



FIG. 2: Detectable region of m modules, each forming a fully connected clique with n nodes. In the inset network, $n = 6$ and $m = 6$. Each point shows the numerically exact value of m that solves $\Delta L(\mathsf{M}) = 0$ for a given n. The solid and dashed lines show the resolution limits of the map equation according to Eq. (13) and modularity, respectively.

in Fig. 2 shows an excellent agreement between the numerical result and the approximation from above. The resolution limit of the map equation is in practice many orders of magnitudes smaller than the resolution limit of modularity. For clique size 6, for example, the map equation can resolve modules in a ring network that is a million times larger. If this natural scale is not appropriate for the problem at hand, and a multi-level solution is not an option, the scale can be modified by altering the Markov dynamics [11, 12]. More importantly, the resolution limit does not depend on the number of links in the network, as for modularity, but on the cut size. As we show later, this feature makes the resolution limit less restrictive and has important implications on performance.

We now turn to the hierarchical map equation [18], the multi-level generalization of the two-level method described above. For example, the three-level map equation can consider movements within and between supermodules, modules in supermodules, and nodes in modules. In the general case, this hierarchy of nested modules can be extended locally among the modules as long as it reduces the minimal description length. Because modification of a partition at a certain level updates the description length of movements within and between affected modules only and does not alter the description length of supermodules or submodules at other levels, $\Delta L(\mathsf{M})$ for the hierarchical map equation turns out to be analogous to that of the two-level map equation (see the Supplementary Material for details). Consequently, in principle, the resolution limit still exists for the hierarchical map equation. In practice, however, there is a large quantitative difference. When we modify the partition of nodes in a supermodule, the global part depends on the cut size inside the supermodule. Thus, the resolution limit derives from the structure of the supermodule rather than from the structure of the entire network. In this way, the



FIG. 3: Detected size of modules for each Sierpinski triangle of different size l with the two-level method (circular points) and the multi-level method (cross points). The Sierpinski triangles up to three levels are illustrated at the top. The boundary of the shaded region shows the resolution limit of the module size obtained with Eq. (13).

hierarchical map equation can resolve smaller modules.

To demonstrate the performance of the hierarchical map equation, we use Sierpinski triangles, as shown in the inset of Fig. 3. Using the code distributed at `http://www.mapequation.org`, we identify modules in the Sierpinski triangles of different sizes with the two-level and the multi-level method. For the multi-level method, we focus on the results at the finest level. While the result of the two-level method is harmed by the resolution limit, the multi-level method detects the triangles at the lowest level in any network size. Therefore, we conclude that the multi-level method is effectively resolution limit-free.

The different effect of the resolution limit on the two-level and the multi-level method can be observed in real networks as well. Figure 4 shows the module size distributions of the collaboration network of authors of scientific papers from DBLP computer science bibliography and the co-purchasing network of products in Amazon.com [22, 23] (see the Supplementary Material for more examples). Here size refers to the number of nodes in a module, but the effect of the resolution limit is nevertheless clear. The multi-level method detects many more smaller modules [24]. We can estimate the theoretical resolution limit by estimating the cut size in Eq. (13). The cut size is bounded below by the number of modules detected by the multi-level method and above by the number of links in the network. For the DBLP network, these numbers are $29,252$ and $1,049,866$, respectively, and the left-hand side of Eq. (13) falls between these values for $l_c \approx 11$ [25]. As Fig. 4 shows, because real networks have modules of varying strength, the resolution limit does not force a clear separation between detected and undetected module sizes. For real networks, the theoretical resolution limit is instead the point at which we



FIG. 4: Module size distributions of (a) the collaboration network of authors of scientific papers from DBLP computer science bibliography and (b) the co-purchasing network of products in Amazon.com. Circles represent the two-level method and crosses represent the multi-level method.

can expect deviations between a two-level method and a multi-level method.

In summary, we have revealed the inner workings of the map equation and estimated its resolution limit (Eq. (13)). While the number of links in the network determines the resolution limit of modularity, the number of links between modules instead determines the resolution limit of the map equation. This less restrictive dependence explains the difference in performance between the methods. Even if the resolution limit in practice is many orders of magnitudes smaller than it is for modularity, for sufficiently large networks the map equation will eventually be affected, as any global two-level objective function is. We argue that the natural solution is to use the hierarchical map equation, and exemplified both with a synthetic and some real-world networks. We conclude that multi-level methods should always be the first choice for simplifying large networks, but that better tools are needed for efficiently working with such structures.

The authors thank Naomichi Hatano for critical reading of the manuscript. T.K. was supported by Kawarabayashi Large Graph Project, ERATO, JST. M.R. was supported by Swedish Research Council grant 2012-3729.

[1] M. Newman and M. Girvan, Phys. Rev. E **69**, 026113 (2004).
[2] G. Palla, I. Derényi, I. Farkas, and T. Vicsek, Nature **435**, 814 (2005).
[3] M. Rosvall and C. Bergstrom, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **105**, 1118 (2008).
[4] J.-C. Delvenne, S. N. Yaliraki, and M. Barahona, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **107**, 12755 (2010).
[5] P. J. Mucha, T. Richardson, K. Macon, M. a. Porter, and J.-P. Onnela, Science **328**, 876 (2010).
[6] U. Luxburg, Statistics and Computing **17**, 395 (2007).
[7] S. Fortunato, Phys. Rep. **486**, 75 (2010).
[8] M. E. J. Newman, Phys. Rev. E **74**, 036104 (2006).
[9] M. E. J. Newman, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **103**, 8577 (2006).

[10] V. D. Blondel, J.-L. Guillaume, R. Lambiotte, and E. Lefebvre, J. Stat. Mech. **2008**, P10008 (2008).
[11] M. T. Schaub, J.-C. Delvenne, S. N. Yaliraki, and M. Barahona, PloS One **7**, e32210 (2012).
[12] M. T. Schaub, R. Lambiotte, and M. Barahona, Phys. Rev. E **86**, 026112 (2012).
[13] R. Lambiotte and M. Rosvall, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 056107 (2012).
[14] A. Lancichinetti and S. Fortunato, Phys. Rev. E **80**, 056117 (2009).
[15] R. Aldecoa and I. Marín, Sci. Rep. **3**, 2216 (2013).
[16] S. Fortunato and M. Barthélemy, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **104**, 36 (2007).
[17] A. Lancichinetti and S. Fortunato, Phys. Rev. E **84**, 066122 (2011).
[18] M. Rosvall and C. T. Bergstrom, PloS One **6**, e18209 (2011).
[19] J. M. Kumpula, J. Saramäki, K. Kaski, and J. Kertész, Eur. Phys. J. B **56**, 41 (2007).
[20] B. H. Good, Y.-A. de Montjoye, and A. Clauset, Phys. Rev. E **81**, 046106 (2010).
[21] J. W. Berry, B. Hendrickson, R. A. LaViolette, and C. A. Phillips, Phys. Rev. E **83**, 056119 (2011).
[22] `http://snap.stanford.edu/data/`.
[23] J. Yang and J. Leskovec, in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD Workshop on Mining Data Semantics* (ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2012), MDS '12, pp. 3:1–3:8.
[24] The multi-level solution is not constructed as a simple decomposition of the two-level solution, but by an attempt to find a global optimal modular description. Therefore, the multi-level method does not trivially detect small modules more than the two-level method does.
[25] Note that the number of nodes n within a module is bounded by the number of links l within the module by $n \leq l + 1$. The equality holds for a module of a tree. Therefore, the results of the two-level method and the multi-level method should deviate from each other by about $n \simeq l$.

arXiv:1402.4385v1 [physics.soc-ph] 18 Feb 2014

The map equation and the resolution limit in community detection Supplemental Material

Tatsuro Kawamoto[1] and Martin Rosvall[2]

[1] *Department of Physics, The University of Tokyo, Komaba, Meguro, Tokyo 153-8505, Japan*
[2] *Integrated Science Lab, Department of Physics, Umeå University, SE-901 87 Umeå, Sweden*

(Dated: February 19, 2014)

I. FINE TUNING AND COARSE TUNING

The map equation measures how effective a particular modular description is, and minimizing the map equation corresponds to making modules as dense as possible while still keeping them small. Here we investigate how this trade-off is resolved in a general case.

The analysis carried out in the main text for the resolution limit corresponds to a greedy update at the modular level, i.e., we considered whether two selected modules should be merged or not. This update will never separate two modules once merged, which easily leads to misassignments of nodes. Therefore, the Infomap algorithm uses two additional updates called *fine tuning* and *coarse tuning* [1], which we analyze here. Fine tuning evaluates the movement of a node from one module to another. As illustrated in Fig. 1, the movement may resolve a misassignment of a node and provide a more modular solution. That is, stronger connections within modules and weaker connections between modules. Similarly, coarse tuning evaluates the movement of a module from one supermodule to another.

We focus on fine tuning of the two-level method and start with the most general case. Figures 2(a) and 2(b) schematize a modular partitioning before and after the movement of node $\mathcal{M}_*$, and we evaluate when this update is accepted. We refer to the partition before the movement as $\mathbf{A}$; we denote $\mathcal{M}_1 + \mathcal{M}_* =: \mathcal{M}_{\rm I}^{\mathbf{A}}$ and $\mathcal{M}_2 =: \mathcal{M}_{\rm II}^{\mathbf{A}}$. We refer to the partition after the movement as $\mathbf{B}$; we denote $\mathcal{M}_1 =: \mathcal{M}_{\rm I}^{\mathbf{B}}$ and $\mathcal{M}_* + \mathcal{M}_2 =: \mathcal{M}_{\rm II}^{\mathbf{B}}$. As we did in the main text, we denote the rest of the network by $\mathcal{M}_3$, which may consist of many modules. As we showed in the main text, the update is accepted when R satisfies the following condition:

$$R \lesssim \delta \left(2 + \log\left(\mathrm{e}\, C\right)\right), \tag{1}$$

with $\delta = -(l_{1*} - l_{2*})$ (note that δ is defined as the minus of the change in the cut size C) and

$$R = \mathcal{L}_{\rm I}^{\mathbf{B}} + \mathcal{L}_{\rm II}^{\mathbf{B}} - \mathcal{L}_{\rm I}^{\mathbf{A}} - \mathcal{L}_{\rm II}^{\mathbf{A}}, \tag{2}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm I}^{\mathbf{B}} = -(l_{1*} + l_{12} + l_{13}) \log(l_{1*} + l_{12} + l_{13}) + (l_1 + l_{1*} + l_{12} + l_{13}) \log(l_1 + l_{1*} + l_{12} + l_{13}), \tag{3}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm II}^{\mathbf{B}} = -(l_{1*} + l_{3*} + l_{12} + l_{23}) \log(l_{1*} + l_{3*} + l_{12} + l_{23}) + (l_2 + l_*^{\rm out} + l_{12} + l_{23}) \log(l_2 + l_*^{\rm out} + l_{12} + l_{23}), \tag{4}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm I}^{\mathbf{A}} = -(l_{2*} + l_{3*} + l_{12} + l_{13}) \log(l_{2*} + l_{3*} + l_{12} + l_{13}) + (l_1 + l_*^{\rm out} + l_{12} + l_{13}) \log(l_1 + l_*^{\rm out} + l_{12} + l_{13}), \tag{5}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm II}^{\mathbf{A}} = -(l_{2*} + l_{12} + l_{23}) \log(l_{2*} + l_{12} + l_{23}) + (l_2 + l_{2*} + l_{12} + l_{23}) \log(l_2 + l_{2*} + l_{12} + l_{23}). \tag{6}$$

As shown in Figs. 2(a) and 2(b), $l_{xy}\,(x, y = \{1, 2, 3, *\})$ represents the number of links connecting $\mathcal{M}_x$ and $\mathcal{M}_y$ and $l_*^{\rm out} = l_{1*} + l_{2*} + l_{3*}$. Typically, when the cut size is sufficiently large, the update is favored when $l_{2*} > l_{1*}$ ($\delta > 0$) and disfavored when $l_{2*} < l_{1*}$ ($\delta < 0$). That is, the node between the modules is assigned to the module to which it has the strongest connection.

One may expect that a node connected to two modules always should be assigned to maximize the density of links within modules and minimize it between modules. However, since the map equation measures the description length of movements both between and within modules, this expectation does not always hold true. Instead, minimizing the map equation corresponds to making modules as dense as possible while still keeping them small. To illustrate this trade-off, we consider an example where $l_{12} = l_{3*} = 0$ and $l_{13} = l_{23} = 1$ in Fig. 2. The value of R now becomes

$$\begin{aligned} R(l_{1*}, l_{2*}, l_1, l_2) = &-2(1 + l_{1*}) \log(1 + l_{1*}) + 2(1 + l_{2*}) \log(1 + l_{2*}) \\ &+ (1 + l_{1*} + l_1) \log(1 + l_{1*} + l_1) - (1 + l_{2*} + l_2) \log(1 + l_{2*} + l_2) \\ &- (1 + l_{1*} + l_{2*} + l_1) \log(1 + l_{1*} + l_{2*} + l_1) + (1 + l_{1*} + l_{2*} + l_2) \log(1 + l_{1*} + l_{2*} + l_2). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

In Fig. 3, each curve indicates R/δ as a function of l_{1*} ($0 < l_{1*} < 15$), for a given set of the module sizes (l_1, l_2), when $l_{2*} = 10$. Notice that the favored/disfavored region flips at $l_{1*} = l_{2*}$. The update is accepted whenever R/δ is lower (higher) than $2 + \log(\mathrm{e}\, C)$ in $l_{1*} < l_{2*}$ ($l_{1*} > l_{2*}$). The shaded region indicates the range in which $2 + \log(\mathrm{e}\, C)$ may be when the number of links in the network is of order 10^6. Note that the cut size C before the update is bounded



FIG. 1: An example of the tuning update. Fine tuning considers the movement of a node from one module to another and coarse tuning considers the movement of a module from one supermodule to another.



FIG. 2: General schematic picture for the tuning; (a) represents the partition before the update and (b) represents the partition after the update. We analyze the case where $l_{12} = l_{3*} = 0$ and $l_{13} = l_{23} = 1$ as an example.



FIG. 3: Plots of R/δ as a function of l_{1*} when $l_{2*} = 10$, $l_{12} = l_{3*} = 0$, and $l_{13} = l_{23} = 1$ in Fig. 2. The shaded region indicate the value of $2 + \log(e\,C)$ in $12 < C < 10^6$.

below by 12 in this example. Figure 3 indicates that, when the modules have a large scale difference and the cut size C is small, the suggested fine tuning should be rejected. That is, the node in the middle should be assigned to the smaller module even if it has a stronger connection to the larger module, because reducing the description length of movements between modules does not compensate the increased description length of movements within modules. Notice, however, that rejecting fine tuning does not necessarily mean the partition before the update is a local optimum; the partition with node $\mathcal{M}_*$ as a single module may be better.

II. THE HIERARCHICAL MAP EQUATION

In this section, we explain the details of the hierarchical map equation [1]. Again, we restrict ourselves to the undirected unweighted networks. Analogously to the two-level method, the quality function of the multi-level method is defined by

$$L(\mathbf{M}) = q_{\curvearrowright} H(\mathcal{Q}) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i\circlearrowright} H(\mathcal{Q}_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} q_{ij\circlearrowright} H(\mathcal{Q}_{ij}) + \cdots + \sum_{ij\ldots k} p_{ij\ldots k\circlearrowright} H(\mathcal{P}_{ij\ldots k}), \tag{8}$$

with

$$H(\mathcal{Q}) = -\sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{q_{i\curvearrowright}}{q_{\curvearrowright}} \log \frac{q_{i\curvearrowright}}{q_{\curvearrowright}}, \tag{9}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} H(\mathcal{Q}_i) = -\sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{q_{i\curvearrowright}}{q_{i\circlearrowright}} \log \frac{q_{i\curvearrowright}}{q_{i\circlearrowright}} - \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \frac{q_{ij\curvearrowright}}{q_{i\circlearrowright}} \log \frac{q_{ij\curvearrowright}}{q_{i\circlearrowright}}, \tag{10}$$

$$\sum_{ij\ldots k} H(\mathcal{P}_{ij\ldots k}) = -\sum_{ij\ldots k} \frac{q_{ij\ldots k\curvearrowright}}{p_{ij\ldots k\circlearrowright}} \log \frac{q_{ij\ldots k\curvearrowright}}{p_{ij\ldots k\circlearrowright}} - \sum_{ij\ldots k}\sum_{\alpha\in ij\ldots k} \frac{p_\alpha}{p_{ij\ldots k\circlearrowright}} \log \frac{p_\alpha}{p_{ij\ldots k\circlearrowright}}, \tag{11}$$

where $q_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_x\curvearrowright}$ is the probability that a random walker exits from the module i_x in the xth level and $q_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_x\circlearrowright}$ is the probability that the random walker stays within the module i_x and exits from it. As we mentioned in the main text, the probability of entering and exiting a module are equal in the present situation. Thus, we replaced the entering probability with the exiting probability in order to simplify the notation. As before, p_α is the probability that the random walker is at the node α. Following what we did for the two-level method, we can write (8) as

$$\begin{aligned} L(\mathbf{M}) = {} & q_{\curvearrowright} \log q_{\curvearrowright} + \sum_{i_1} q_{i_1\circlearrowright} \log q_{i_1\circlearrowright} + \sum_{i_1 i_2} q_{i_1 i_2\circlearrowright} \log q_{i_1 i_2\circlearrowright} + \cdots + \sum_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_k} q_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_k\circlearrowright} \log q_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_k\circlearrowright} - \sum_{\alpha} p_\alpha \log p_\alpha \\ & - 2\left(\sum_{i_1} q_{i_1\curvearrowright} \log q_{i_1\curvearrowright} + \sum_{i_1 i_2} q_{i_1 i_2\curvearrowright} \log q_{i_1 i_2\curvearrowright} + \cdots + \sum_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_k} q_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_k\curvearrowright} \log q_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_k\curvearrowright} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

We then consider the difference of the map equation by an update. The modification of the partition at a certain level does not affect the partitions in higher and lower levels. It alters the description length of the movements between the modules of the modified level, as well as the description length of movements within the modified module (it can also be regarded as the movement between submodules) and exiting from it. Therefore, the difference of the map equation for the alteration in the xth level is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta L(\mathbf{M}) = {} & q^{\mathbf{B}}_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_{x-1}\circlearrowright} \log q^{\mathbf{B}}_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_{x-1}\circlearrowright} - q^{\mathbf{A}}_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_{x-1}\circlearrowright} \log q^{\mathbf{A}}_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_{x-1}\circlearrowright} \\ & - 2\left(\sum_{i'_x} q^{\mathbf{B}}_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i'_x\curvearrowright} \log q^{\mathbf{B}}_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i'_x\curvearrowright} - \sum_{i_x} q^{\mathbf{A}}_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_x\curvearrowright} \log q^{\mathbf{A}}_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_x\curvearrowright} \right) \\ & + \left(\sum_{i'_x} q^{\mathbf{B}}_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i'_x\circlearrowright} \log q^{\mathbf{B}}_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i'_x\circlearrowright} - \sum_{i_x} q^{\mathbf{A}}_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_x\circlearrowright} \log q^{\mathbf{A}}_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_x\circlearrowright} \right), \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

which is analogous to that of the two-level method,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta L_{\mathrm{two-level}}(\mathbf{M}) = {} & q^{\mathbf{B}}_{\curvearrowright} \log q^{\mathbf{B}}_{\curvearrowright} - q^{\mathbf{A}}_{\curvearrowright} \log q^{\mathbf{A}}_{\curvearrowright} \\ & - 2\left(\sum_{i'=1}^{m'} q^{\mathbf{B}}_{i'\curvearrowright} \log q^{\mathbf{B}}_{i'\curvearrowright} - \sum_{i=1}^{m} q^{\mathbf{A}}_{i\curvearrowright} \log q^{\mathbf{A}}_{i\curvearrowright} \right) + \left(\sum_{i'=1}^{m'} p^{\mathbf{B}}_{i'\circlearrowright} \log p^{\mathbf{B}}_{i'\circlearrowright} - \sum_{i=1}^{m} p^{\mathbf{A}}_{i\circlearrowright} \log p^{\mathbf{A}}_{i\circlearrowright} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Instead of $q_{\curvearrowright}$ in the two-level method in the above equation, we have

$$q_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_{x-1}\circlearrowright} = q_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_{x-1}\curvearrowright} + \sum_{i_x} q_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_x\curvearrowright} \tag{15}$$

for the multi-level method; hence, other than the extra term $q_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_{x-1}\curvearrowright}$ in $q_{i_1 i_2 \ldots i_{x-1}\circlearrowright}$, the mathematical structure of the hierarchical map equation is analogous to that of the two-level method.

	# of nodes	# of links	# of communities (two-level)	# of communities (multi-level)
DBLP	338,029	1,049,866	16,450	29,252
Amazon (co-purchase)	334,863	925,872	15,685	34,802
Facebook	63,731	1,269,502	2,268	2,819
arXiv_hep-th	48,239	352,807	1,332	2,247
California	1,965,206	2,766,607	82,322	344,485
Amazon (rating)	3,376,972	5,838,041	350,419	480,810

TABLE I: Data of real networks.



FIG. 4: The community size distributions of (a) the network of citations in arXiv's High Energy Physics – Theory (hep-th) section [4], (b) the friendship network on Facebook [5], (c) the road network of California [6] in the U. S. A., and (d) the bipartite rating network of products in Amazon.com [7] in the log-log scale with partial-logarithmic binning. The circular points represent the result of the two-level method and the cross points represent the result in the finest level of the multi-level method. Note that the size of a module here does not indicate the number of links, but the number of nodes within the module.

III. MODULE SIZE DISTRIBUTIONS OF REAL NETWORKS

In addition to the collaboration network of authors of scientific papers from DBLP computer science bibliography and the co-purchasing network of products in Amazon.com in the main text, we list the results for four more real networks with the distributed code of Infomap [2]. Figure 4 shows their module size distributions, using the data distributed at [3]. The size of each network and the total number of detected modules are listed in Table I. Note that the Amazon rating network is a bipartite network; the random walker in a bipartite network has periodic stationary states by nature, but we assume the non-periodic solution with visit rates given by Eq. (3) in the main text and all derived results apply. For some of these networks, such as the arXiv citation network and the Facebook friendship network, the resolution limit has little effect on the two-level method and the depth of the hierarchy in the multi-level method is shallow. Nonetheless, in all cases the multi-level method detects more small communities than the two-level method does.

[1] M. Rosvall and C. T. Bergstrom, PloS one **6**, e18209 (2011).
[2] `http://www.mapequation.org/`.
[3] `http://konect.uni-koblenz.de/`.
[4] J. Leskovec, J. Kleinberg, and C. Faloutsos, ACM Trans. Knowledge Discovery from Data **1**, 1 (2007).
[5] B. Viswanath, A. Mislove, M. Cha, and K. P. Gummadi, in *Proc. Workshop on Online Social Networks* (2009), pp. 37–42.
[6] J. Leskovec, K. J. Lang, A. Dasgupta, and M. W. Mahoney, in *Proc. Int. World Wide Web Conf.* (2008), pp. 695–704.
[7] N. Jindal and B. Liu, in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Web Search and Web Data Mining* (ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2008), WSDM '08, pp. 219–230.